

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

William James Clark, #11798-055)	Civil Action No.: 1:13-556-MGL
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Doctor V. Loranth, Clinical Director,)	ORDER AND OPINION
Warden Cruz; Associate Warden)	
Johnson; and Associate Warden)	
Langford,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff William James Clark (“Plaintiff”) an inmate at the Federal Correctional Institution (“FCI”) Williamsburg proceeding pro se filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). Before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction to be housed either in the Richland County Jail in Columbia, South Carolina, or at the Federal Medical Center (“FMS”) Butner during the pendency of his law suit. (ECF No. 17).

The matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Hodges recommends that Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction be denied. No objections have been filed to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v.*

Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir.1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir.2005) (quoting Fed.R.Civ.P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S.Ct. 466, 88 L.Ed.2d 435 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir.1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir.1984).

After a thorough review of the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 20) by reference into this order. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Spartanburg, South Carolina
May 17, 2013

/s/ Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge